arXiv:0706.3234v1 [q-bio.QM] 21 Jun 2007

Reverse engineering time discrete finite dynamical systems: A feasible undertaking?

Edgar Delgado-Eckert[*†‡]

Abstract

With the advent of high-throughput profiling methods, interest in reverse engineering the structure and dynamics of biochemical networks is high. Recently an algorithm for reverse engineering of biochemical networks was developed by Laubenbacher and Stigler. It is a top-down approach using time discrete dynamical systems. One of its key steps includes the choice of a term order. The aim of this paper is to identify minimal requirements on data sets to be used with this algorithm and to characterize optimal data sets. We found minimal requirements on a data set based on how many terms the functions to be reverse engineered display. Furthermore, we identified optimal data sets, which we characterized using a geometric property called "general position". Moreover, we developed a constructive method to generate optimal data sets, provided a codimensional condition is fulfilled. In addition, we present a generalization of their algorithm that does not depend on the choice of a term order. For this method we derived a formula for the probability of finding the correct model, provided the data set used is optimal. We analyzed the asymptotic behavior of the probability formula for a growing number of variables n (i.e. interacting chemicals). Unfortunately, this formula converges to zero as fast as r^{q^n}, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < r < 1$. Therefore, even if an optimal data set is used and the restrictions in using term orders are overcome, the reverse engineering problem remains unfeasible, unless prodigious amounts of data are available. Such large data sets are experimentally impossible to generate with today's technologies.

Keywords: Reverse engineering, data requirements, biochemical networks, time discrete dynamical systems, orthogonality

1 Introduction

Since the development of multiple and simultaneous measurement techniques such as microarray technologies, reverse engineering of biochemical and, in particular, gene regulatory

[*]Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Technische Universität München, Boltzmannstr.3, 85747 Garching, Germany. Email: edgar.delgado-eckert@mytum.de

[†]Pathology Department, Tufts University, 150 Harrison Av., Boston, MA 02111, USA (*correspondence address*).

[‡]The author acknowledges support by a Public Health Service grant (RO1 AI062989) to David Thorley-Lawson at Tufts University, Boston, MA.

networks has become a more important problem in systems biology . One well-known reverse engineering approach are the top-down methods, which try to infer network properties based on the observed global input-output-response. The observed input-output-response is usually only partially described by available experimental data.

Depending on the type of mathematical model used to describe a biochemical process, a variety of top-down reverse engineering algorithms have been proposed (De Jong, 2002), (D'haeseleer *et al.* , 2000), (Gardner & Faith, 2005). Each modeling paradigm presents different requirements relative to quality and amount of the experimental data needed. Moreover, for each type of model, a suitable mathematical framework has to be developed in order to study the performance and limitations of reverse engineering methods. For any given modeling paradigm and reverse engineering method it is important to answer the following questions:

1. What are the minimal requirements on data sets?

2. Can data sets be characterized in such a way that "optimal" data sets can be identified? (Optimality meaning that the algorithm performs better using such a data set compared to its performance using other data sets.)

The second question is related to the *design of experiments* and optimality is characterized in terms of *quantity and quality* of the data sets.

(Laubenbacher & Stigler, 2004) developed a top-down reverse engineering algorithm for the modeling paradigm of time discrete finite dynamical systems. Herein, we will refer to it as the LS-algorithm. They apply their method to biochemical networks by modeling the network as a time discrete finite dynamical system, obtained by discretizing the concentration levels of the interacting chemicals to elements of a finite field. One of the key steps of the LS-algorithm includes the choice of a term order. The modeling paradigm of time discrete finite dynamical systems generalizes the Boolean approach (Kauffman, 1993) (where the field only contains the elements 0 and 1). Moreover, it is a special case of the paradigm described in (Thomas, 1991).

Some aspects of the performance of the LS-algorithm were studied by (Just, 2006) in a probabilistic framework.

In this paper we investigate the two questions stated above in the particular case of the LS-algorithm. For this purpose, we developed a mathematical framework[1] that allows us to study the LS-algorithm in depth. Having expressed the steps of the LS-algorithm in our framework, we were able to provide concrete answers to both questions: First, we found minimal requirements on a data set based on how many terms the functions to be reverse engineered display. Second, we identified optimal data sets, which we characterize using a geometric property called "general position". Moreover, we developed a constructive method to generate optimal data sets, provided a codimensional condition is fulfilled.

In addition, we present a generalization of the LS-algorithm that does not depend on the choice of a term order. We call this generalization the *term-order-free reverse engineering method.* For this method we derive a formula for the probability of finding the correct

[1] This framework is based on a general linear algebraic result stated in (Delgado-Eckert, under review).

model[2], provided the data set used satisfies an optimality criterion. Furthermore, we analyze the asymptotic behavior of the probability formula for a growing number of variables n (i.e. interacting chemicals). Unfortunately, this formula converges to zero as fast as r^{q^n}, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < r < 1$. Consequently, we conclude that even if an optimal data set is used and the restrictions imposed by the use of term orders are overcome, the reverse engineering problem remains unfeasible, unless experimentally impracticable amounts of data are available. This result discouraged us from including in this paper any computational and algorithmic aspects of the term-order-free reverse engineering method.

In contrast to (Just, 2006), we focus here on providing possible criteria for the design of specific experiments instead of assuming that the data sets are generated randomly. Moreover, we do not necessarily assume that information about the actual number of interactions in the biochemical network is available.

The organization of this article is the following:

Section 2 is devoted to the mathematical background: We briefly describe the LS-algorithm and provide a mathematical framework to study it. Moreover, we introduce the term-order-free reverse engineering method. We finish the section with a clear formulation of the questions studied in this paper. Section 3 presents rigorous results and some of their consequences. In Section 4 we summarize our main results, discuss their consequences and provide further conclusions.

To fully understand the technical details of our analysis, very basic knowledge in linear algebra and algebra of multivariate polynomials is required. We refer the interested reader to (Golan, 2004) and (Cox *et al.* , 1997).

2 Mathematical background

2.1 A short description of the LS-algorithm

In the modeling paradigm described by (Laubenbacher & Stigler, 2004), a biological or biochemical system described by n varying quantities is studied by taking m consecutive measurements of each of the interacting quantities. This yields one time series

$$\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 = (s_{11}, s_{12}, ..., s_{1n}), ..., \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_m = (s_{m1}, s_{m2}, ..., s_{mn})$$

Such series of consecutive measurements are repeated t times starting from different initial conditions, where the length m_k of the series may vary. At the end of this experimental procedure, several time series are obtained:

$$\begin{array}{c} \overrightarrow{\mathbf{s1}}_1, ..., \overrightarrow{\mathbf{s1}}_{m_1} \\ \vdots \\ \overrightarrow{\mathbf{sk}}_1, ..., \overrightarrow{\mathbf{sk}}_{m_k} \\ \vdots \\ \overrightarrow{\mathbf{st}}_1, ..., \overrightarrow{\mathbf{st}}_{m_t} \end{array}$$

[2] We will give a precise definition of "correct model".

Each point in a time series is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Time series are then discretized using a discretization algorithm that can be expressed as a map

$$D : \mathbb{R}^n \to S^n \tag{1}$$

where the set S is a finite field of cardinality $p := |S|$ (the cardinality of the field used is determined during the discretization process). The discretized time series can be written as

$$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{dk}}_1 := D(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{sk}}_1), ..., \overrightarrow{\mathbf{dk}}_{m_k} := D(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{sk}}_{m_k}),\ k = 1, ..., t$$

One fundamental assumption made in their paper is that the evolution in time of the discretized vectors obeys a simple rule, namely, that there is a function

$$F : S^n \to S^n$$

such that

$$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{dk}}_{i+1} = F(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{dk}}_i) \text{ for } i = 1, ..., m_k - 1,\ k = 1, ..., t \tag{2}$$

(Laubenbacher & Stigler, 2004) call F the transition function of the system. One key ingredient in the LS-algorithm is the fact that the set S is endowed with the algebraic structure of a finite field. Under this assumption, the rule (2) reduces to a polynomial interpolation problem in each component, i.e. for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$

$$\mathbf{dk}_{(i+1)j} = F_j(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{dk}}_i) \text{ for } k = 1, ..., t,\ i = 1, ..., m_k - 1 \tag{3}$$

The information provided by the equations (3) usually underdetermines the function $F_j : S^n \to S$, unless for all possible vectors $\vec{x} \in S^n$, the values $F_j(\vec{x})$ are established by (3). Indeed, any non-zero polynomial function that vanishes on all the data inputs

$$X := \{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{dk}}_i \mid k = 1, ..., t,\ i = 1, ..., m_k - 1\}$$

could be added to a function satisfying the conditions (3) and yield a different function that also satisfies (3). Among all those possible solutions, the LS-algorithm chooses the *most parsimonious* interpolating polynomial function $F_j : S^n \to S$ according to some chosen term order. To generate the most parsimonious function the algorithm first takes as input the discretized time series and generates functions f_j, $j = 1, ..., n$ that satisfy (3) for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ correspondingly. Secondly, it takes a monomial order $<_j$ as input and generates the normal form of f_j with respect to the vanishing ideal $I(X)$ and the given order $<$. For every $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, this normal form is the output F_j of the algorithm.
We also refer to 2.1 in (Just, 2006) for another rigorous description of the LS-algorithm.

2.2 A mathematical framework to study the reverse engineering problem

The mathematical framework presented here is based on a general result stated in (Delgado-Eckert, under review). This framework will allow us to study the LS-algorithm as well as a

generalized algorithm of it that is independent on the choice of term orders.
We start with the original problem: Given a time-discrete dynamical system over a finite field S in n variables

$$F : S^n \to S^n$$

and a data set $X \subseteq S^n$ generated by iterating the function F starting at one or more initial values, what are the chances of reconstructing the function F if the LS-algorithm or a similar algorithm is applied using X as input time series?[3] Since the algorithms studied here generate an output model $G : S^n \to S^n$ by calculating every single coordinate function $G_i : S^n \to S$ separately, we will focus on the reconstruction of a single coordinate function F_i which we will simply call f. We will use the notation $\mathbf{F}_q$ for a finite field of cardinality $q \in \mathbb{N}$. In what follows, we briefly review the main definitions and results stated and proved in (Delgado-Eckert, under review):
We denote the q^n-dimensional vector space of functions $g : \mathbf{F}_q^n \to \mathbf{F}_q$ with $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. A basis for $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ is given by all the monomial functions $\overrightarrow{x}^{\alpha} := x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot ... \cdot x_1^{\alpha_n}$ where the exponents α_i are non-negative integers satisfying $\alpha_i < q$. The set of all those monomial functions is denoted with $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$, where $M_q^n := \{\alpha \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^n \mid \alpha_j < q \; \forall \; j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$. We call those monomial functions *fundamental monomial functions.*

Theorem 1 (and Definition) *Let $\mathbf{F}_q$ be a finite field and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ natural numbers with $m \leq q^n$. Further let*

$$\vec{X} := (\vec{x}_1, ..., \vec{x}_m) \in (\mathbf{F}_q^n)^m$$

be a tuple of m ***different*** *n-tuples with entries in the field $\mathbf{F}_q$. Then the mapping*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Phi_{\vec{X}} & : & F_n(\mathbf{F}_q) \to \mathbf{F}_q^m \\ f & \mapsto & \Phi_{\vec{X}}(f) := (f(\vec{x}_1), ..., f(\vec{x}_m))^t \end{array}$$

is a surjective linear operator. $\Phi_{\vec{X}}$ is called the evaluation epimorphism of the tuple $\vec{X}$.

For a given set $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ of data points, the interpolation problem of finding a function $g \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ with the property

$$g(\vec{x}_i) = b_i \; \forall \; i \in \{1, ..., m\}, \; x_i \in X$$

can be expressed using the evaluation epimorphism as: Find a function $g \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ with the property

$$\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b} \tag{4}$$

Since a basis of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ is given by the fundamental monomial functions $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$, the matrix

$$A := (\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g_{nq\alpha}))_{\alpha \in M_q^n} \in M(m \times q^n; \mathbf{F}_q)$$

[3] From an experimental point of view the following question arises: What is the function F in an experimental setting? Contrary to the situation when models with an infinite number of possible states are reverse engineered (see 1.2 in (Ljung, 1999)), there is a finite number of experiments that could be, at least theoretically, performed to *completely* characterize the system studied. In this sense, even in an experimental setting, there is an underlying function F. The components of this function is what (Just, 2006) called h_{true}.

representing the evaluation epimorphism $\Phi_{\vec{X}}$ of the tuple $\vec{X}$ with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ and the canonical basis of $\mathbf{F}_q^m$ has always the full rank $m = \min(m, q^n)$. That also means, that the dimension of the $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ is

$$\dim(\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})) = \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)) - m = q^n - m \tag{5}$$

In the case $m < q^n$ where m is strictly smaller than $q^n = \left|\mathbf{F}_q^n\right|$ we have $\dim(\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})) > 0$ and the solution of the interpolation problem is not unique. There are exactly $q^{\dim(\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}}))}$ different solutions which constitute an affine subspace of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. Only in the case $m = q^n$, that means, when for all elements of $\mathbf{F}_q^n$ the corresponding interpolation values are given, the solution is unique. If the problem is underdetermined and no additional information about properties of the possible solutions is given, any algorithm attempting to solve the problem has to provide a selection criterion to pick a solution among the affine space of possible solutions. The LS-algorithm chooses the most parsimonious interpolating polynomial function according to some chosen term order. A more geometric approach to pick one solution would be to select the solution that is perpendicular (or orthogonal) to the affine space of solutions. As stated in Remark and Theorem 32 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review), the solution selected by the LS-algorithm is precisely the orthogonal solution. For orthogonality to apply, a generalized inner product has to be defined on the space $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. We finish this subsection reviewing this concepts (cf. (Delgado-Eckert, under review)).
The space $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ is endowed with a symmetric bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \times V \to K$, i.e. a generalized inner product. Orthogonality and orthonormality are defined as in an Euclidean vector space.
For a given set $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ of data points, consider the evaluation epimorphism $\Phi_{\vec{X}}$ of the tuple $\vec{X}$ and its kernel $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$. Now, let $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ be a basis of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}}) \subseteq F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. By the basis extension theorem, we can extend the basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ to a basis

$$(u_1, ..., u_s, u_{s+1}, ..., u_d)$$

of the whole space $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. (There are many possible ways this extension can be performed. See more details below). As in example 6 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review), we can construct a generalized inner product on $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ by setting

$$\langle u_i, u_j \rangle := \delta_{ij} \ \forall \ i, j \in \{1, ..., d\}$$

The orthogonal solution of (4) is the solution $v^* \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ that is orthogonal to $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$, i.e. it holds $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(v^*) = \vec{b}$ and for an arbitrary basis $(w_1, ..., w_s)$ of $\ker(T)$ the following orthogonality conditions hold

$$\langle w_i, v^* \rangle = 0 \ \forall \ i \in \{1, ..., s\}$$

The way we extend the basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ to a basis

$$(u_1, ..., u_s, u_{s+1}, ..., u_d)$$

of the whole space $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ determines crucially the generalized inner product we get by setting

$$\langle u_i, u_j \rangle := \delta_{ij} \ \forall \ i, j \in \{1, ..., d\} \tag{6}$$

Consequently, the orthogonal solution of $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b}$ may vary according to the chosen extension $u_{s+1}, ..., u_d \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. In (Delgado-Eckert, under review) a systematic way to extend the basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ to a basis for the whole space is introduced. With the basis obtained, the process of defining a generalized inner product according to (6) is called the *standard orthonormalization.* This is because the basis $(u_1, ..., u_s, u_{s+1}, ..., u_d)$ is orthonormal with respect to the generalized inner product defined by (6).
As shown in Section 5 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review), using the generalized inner product obtained by applying the standard orthonormalization, the functions generated by the LS-algorithm are orthogonal solutions of the polynomial interpolation problem as formulated in (4). Under these assumptions the orthogonal solution is also unique (see theorem 9 in (Delgado-Eckert, under review)).
The standard orthonormalization process depends on the way the elements of the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ of fundamental monomial functions are ordered. If they are ordered according to a term order, the calculation of the orthogonal solution of (4) yields the same result as the LS-algorithm. If more general linear orders are allowed, a more general algorithm emerges that is not restricted to the use of term orders. This algorithm can be seen as a generalization of the LS-algorithm. We call it the *term-order-free reverse engineering method.* The precise definition of the standard orthonormalization procedure is stated in Section 4 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review). In the appendix we summarize the steps of the term-order-free reverse engineering method.

2.3 The questions studied in this paper

The mathematical framework developed in the previous subsection will allow us to answer the following questions regarding the LS-algorithm and its generalization, the term-order-free reverse engineering method:

Problem 2 *Given a function $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$, what are the minimal requirements on a set $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$, such that the LS-algorithm reverse engineers f based on the knowledge of the values that it takes on every point in the set X?*

Problem 3 *Are there sets $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ that make the LS-algorithm more likely to succeed in reverse engineering a function $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ based* only *on the knowledge of the values that it takes on every point in the set X?*[4]

Problem 4 *Given a function $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ and an optimal set $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ (in the sense of the previous problem). If the term order used by the LS-algorithm is chosen randomly, can the probability of success be calculated? If the linear order used by the term-order-free method is chosen randomly, can the probability of success be calculated?*

[4] A solution to this problem would provide criteria for the design of experiments.

Problem 5 *What is the asymptotic behavior of the probability for a growing number of variables n?*

It is pertinent to emphasize that, contrary to the scenario studied in (Just, 2006), we do not necessarily assume that information about the number of variables actually affecting f is available. We will give further comments on this issue at the end of the conclusions.

3 Results

3.1 Basic definitions and facts

For what follows recall that $M_q^n = \{\alpha \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^n \mid \alpha_j < q \; \forall \; j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$.

Lemma 6 (and Definition) *Let K be a field, $n, q \in \mathbb{N}$ natural numbers and $K[\tau_1, ..., \tau_n]$ the polynomial ring in n indeterminates over K. Then the set of all polynomials of the form*

$$\sum_{\alpha \in M_q^n} a_\alpha \tau_1^{\alpha_1} ... \tau_n^{\alpha_n} \in K[\tau_1, ..., \tau_n]$$

with coefficients $a_\alpha \in K$ is a vector space over K. We denote this set with $P_q^n(K) \subset K[\tau_1, ..., \tau_n]$.

Theorem 7 *Let $\mathbf{F}_q$ be a finite field and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a natural number. Then the vector spaces $P_q^n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ and $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ are isomorphic via the mapping*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &: P_q^n(\mathbf{F}_q) \to F_n(\mathbf{F}_q) \\ g &= \sum_{\alpha \in M_q^n} a_\alpha \tau_1^{\alpha_1} ... \tau_n^{\alpha_n} \mapsto \varphi(g)(\vec{x}) := \sum_{\alpha \in M_q^n} a_\alpha \overrightarrow{x}^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Definition 8 *Let K be a field, $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ natural numbers and $K[\tau_1, ..., \tau_n]$ the polynomial ring in n indeterminates over K. Furthermore, let $g_1, ..., g_m \in K[\tau_1, ..., \tau_n]$ be polynomials. The set*

$$\langle g_1, ..., g_m \rangle := \{h_1 g_1 + ... h_m g_m \mid h_1, ..., h_m \in K[\tau_1, ..., \tau_n]\}$$

is called the ideal *generated by $g_1, ..., g_m$.*

For a tuple $\vec{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ we write $x := \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ for the set containing all the entries in the tuple $\vec{x}$.

3.2 Conditions on the data set

Definition 9 *Let $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ be a polynomial function. The subset of $\mathbf{F}_q^n$ containing all values on which the polynomial function f vanishes is denoted by*

$$V(\varphi^{-1}(f))$$

where φ is the mapping defined in theorem (7).

The following result tells us that if we are using the LS-algorithm to reverse engineer a nonzero function we necessarily have to use a data set X containing points where the function does not vanish.

Theorem 10 *Let $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)\backslash\{0\}$ be a nonzero polynomial function. Furthermore let*

$$\vec{X} := (\vec{x}_1, ..., \vec{x}_m) \in (\mathbf{F}_q^n)^m$$

be a tuple of m different n-tuples with entries in the field $\mathbf{F}_q$, $\vec{b} \in \mathbf{F}_q^m$ be the vector defined by

$$b_i := f(\vec{x}_i),\ i = 1, ..., m$$

and $v^*$the orthogonal solution of $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b}$.Then if $v^* = f$ it follows[5]

$$V(\varphi^{-1}(f))^c \cap X \neq \emptyset$$

Proof. If $V(\varphi^{-1}(f))^c \cap X = \emptyset$ then by definition of $V(\varphi^{-1}(f))$, the vector $\vec{b}$ would be equal to the zero vector $\vec{0}$. From Corollary 11 in Subsection 2.2 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review) we know that the orthogonal solution $v^*$of $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{0}$ is the zero function, thus $v^* \neq f$. ■

Theorem 11 *Let $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)\backslash\{0\}$ be a nonzero polynomial function. Furthermore let*

$$\vec{X} := (\vec{x}_1, ..., \vec{x}_m) \in (\mathbf{F}_q^n)^m$$

be a tuple of m different n-tuples with entries in the field $\mathbf{F}_q$, $\vec{b} \in \mathbf{F}_q^m$ be the vector defined by

$$b_i := f(\vec{x}_i),\ i = 1, ..., m$$

and $v^*$the orthogonal solution of $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b}$. In addition, assume $V(\varphi^{-1}(f))^c \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Then it holds

$$v^* = f \Leftrightarrow f \in span(u_{s+1}, ..., u_d)$$

Proof. The claim follows directly from the definition of orthogonal solution and its uniqueness. ■

Remark 12 *From the necessary and sufficient condition*

$$f \in span(u_{s+1}, ..., u_d) \tag{7}$$

it becomes apparent, that if the function f is a linear combination of more than $d - s = m$ fundamental monomial functions, f can not be found as an orthogonal solution v^* of $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b}$. In particular, if f is a linear combination containing all d fundamental monomial functions in $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$, no proper *subset $X \subset \mathbf{F}_q^n$ of $\mathbf{F}_q^n$ will allow us to find f as orthogonal solution of $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b}$ (where $b_i := f(\vec{x}_i)$, $\vec{x}_i \in X$).*

[5] If A is a set, A^c denotes its complement

Remark 13 *From the condition (7) follows that it is* necessary *that a monomial function appearing in f is linearly independent of the basis vectors $u_1, ..., u_s$ of* $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$. *For this reason, the set X should be chosen in such a way that no fundamental monomial function $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ is linearly dependent on the basis vectors $u_1, ..., u_s$ of* $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$. *Otherwise, some of the terms appearing in f might vanish on the set X and wouldn't be detectable by any reverse engineering method, (Laubenbacher & Stigler, 2004). This problem introduces a more general question about the existence of vector subspaces in "general position":*

Definition 14 *Let W be a finite dimensional vector space over a finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$ with* $\dim(W) = d > 0$. *Furthermore, let $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ be a fixed basis of W and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ a natural number with $s < d$. A vector subspace $U \subset W$ with* $\dim(U) = s$ *is said to be in* general position *with respect to the basis $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ if for any basis $(v_1, ..., v_s)$ of U and any injective mapping*

$$\pi : \{1, ..., (d-s)\} \to \{1, ..., d\}$$

the vectors

$$v_1, ..., v_s, w_{\pi(1)}, ..., w_{\pi(d-s)}$$

are linearly independent.

It can be shown, that if the cardinality q of the finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$ is sufficiently large, proper subspaces in general position of any positive dimension always exist. The proof is provided in the appendix.

Now assume that $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ is in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$. Following the basis extension theorem and due to the general position of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$, we can extend the basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ to a basis

$$(u_1, ..., u_s, u_{s+1}, ..., u_d)$$

of the whole space $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$, where $\{u_{s+1}, ..., u_d\} \subset \{g_{nq\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ is *any* subset with $d - s$ elements of $\{g_{nq\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$. Now we can construct a generalized inner product on $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ by setting

$$\langle u_i, u_j \rangle := \delta_{ij} \ \forall \ i, j \in \{1, ..., d\}$$

The advantage in this situation is that there is no bias imposed by the data on the monomial functions that can be used to extend the basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ to a basis of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$, i.e. there are no restrictions on the structure of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})^{\perp}$. In addition, having this degree of freedom, it is possible to calculate the exact probability of success of the method based on the number of fundamental monomial functions actually contained in f. We will give an explicit probability formula in the next Subsection. For our further analysis we need the following intermediate result, whose proof is left to the reader:

Lemma 15 (and Definition) *Let $\mathbf{F}_q$ be a finite field, $n, s \in \mathbb{N}$ natural numbers with $s \leq \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q))$. Furthermore, let $U \subset F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ be an s-dimensional subspace. Then the set*

$$V(U) := V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_s) \rangle) \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$$

where $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ is any basis of U is independent on the choice of basis and it's called the

variety of the subspace U.

Now the following question arises: How should the set X be chosen in order to have $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_q^n}$? For a given natural number $s < d := \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q))$ the idea is to start from a basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ of a vector subspace $U \subset F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_q^n}$. The next step is to calculate the variety

$$Y := V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_s)\rangle) \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$$

We assume $Y \neq \emptyset$ and order its elements arbitrarily to a tuple $\vec{Y} := (\vec{y}_1, ..., \vec{y}_m) \in (\mathbf{F}_q^n)^m$, where $m := |Y|$. We know from Remark 23 in Subsection 3.2 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review) that $\dim(\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})) = \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)) - |Y| = d - m$. Now, in general, for the kernel $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$ of the corresponding evaluation epimorphism $\Phi_{\vec{Y}}$ it holds

$$U \subseteq \ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$$

and therefore $s \leq \dim(\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})) = d - m$, i.e. $m \leq d - s$. Now, the ideal scenario would be the case $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}}) = U$, i.e. $m = d - s$. A less optimistic scenario is given when $U \subset \ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$ is a proper subspace of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$. In such a situation, ideally we would wish for $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$ to be itself in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_q^n}$. This issues raise the following question:
When does there exist a subspace $U \subset F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_q^n}$ with $\dim(U) < \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q))$ that in addition satisfies

$$\left|V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_s)\rangle)\right| = \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)) - \dim(U) \tag{8}$$

This is an interesting question that requires further research. It is related to whether the subspace U is an ideal of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$, when $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ is seen as an algebra with the multiplication of polynomial functions as the multiplicative operation. In the Appendix we provide examples in which two subspaces, both in general position, show a different behavior regarding the condition (8). We formalize this property:

Definition 16 *Let $U \subset F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ be a subspace and $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ an arbitrary basis of U. U is said to satisfy the* codimension condition *if it holds*

$$codim(U) = \left|V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_s)\rangle)\right|$$

where $codim(U) := \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)) - \dim(U)$.

A subspace $U \subset F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_q^n}$ that satisfies the codimension condition allows for the construction of an optimal set for use with the LS-algorithm. The set $Y := V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_s)\rangle)$ (where $u_1, ..., u_s$ is a basis of U) has namely the property $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}}) = U$, i.e. $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$ is in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_q^n}$. In other words, subspaces in general position that satisfy the codimension condition provide a basic component for a constructive method for generating optimal data sets. More generally we define:

Definition 17 *A set* $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ *such that* $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ *is in general position with respect to the basis* $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ *is referred to as* optimal.

Remark 18 (and Definition) *Additional study is required to prove whether optimal data sets exist in general. (See the Appendix for concrete examples.) However, if no optimal sets can be determined, it is still advantageous to work with a data set* X *that was obtained as* $V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_s) \rangle)$*, where* $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ *is a basis for a subspace* U *in general position with respect to the basis* $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$*. In this case, at least* $U \subseteq \ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$ *still holds and it might be that the dimensional difference between* U *and* $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{Y}})$ *is small. We call such data sets* pseudo-optimal.

3.3 Probabilities of finding the original function as the orthogonal solution

Theorem 19 *Let* $\mathbf{F}_q$ *be a finite field,* $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ *natural numbers with* $m < \dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)) =: d$*. Furthermore, let* $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q) \backslash \{0\}$ *be a nonzero function consisting of a linear combination of exactly* t *fundamental monomial functions and*

$$\vec{X} := (\vec{x}_1, ..., \vec{x}_m) \in (\mathbf{F}_q^n)^m$$

a tuple of m *different* n*-tuples with entries in the field* $\mathbf{F}_q$ *such that* X *is optimal. Now let* $\vec{b} \in \mathbf{F}_q^m$ *be the vector defined as*

$$b_i := f(\vec{y}_i),\ i = 1, ..., m$$

$s := \dim(\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})) = d - m$ *(cf. (5)),* $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ *a basis for* $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ *and* $\{u_{s+1}, ..., u_d\} \subset \{g_{nq\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ an arbitrary *subset containing* $d - s$ *elements. Then the probability* P *that the orthogonal solution* g^* *of* $\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g) = \vec{b}$ *with respect to the generalized inner product*

$$\langle u_i, u_j \rangle := \delta_{ij}\ \forall\ i, j \in \{1, ..., d\}$$

fulfills $f = g^*$ *is given by*

$$P = \frac{\binom{q^n - t}{q^n - m}}{\binom{q^n}{m}} \text{ if } t \leq m \tag{9}$$

and

$$P = 0 \text{ if } t > m$$

Proof. Due to the definition of general position, there are exactly

$$(d-s)! \binom{\dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q))}{\dim(F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)) - s} = (d-s)! \binom{d}{d-s} = (d-s)! \binom{q^n}{m}$$

different ways to extend a basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ of U to a basis of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ using $m = d - s$ fundamental monomial functions. If $t \leq m$, among such extensions, only

$$(d-s)! \binom{d-t}{d-s-t} = (d-s)! \binom{q^n - t}{s} = (d-s)! \binom{q^n - t}{q^n - m}$$

use the t fundamental monomial functions appearing in f. Now (9) follows immediately. If, on the other hand, $t > m$, the number of fundamental monomial functions usable to extend a basis $(u_1, ..., u_s)$ of $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ to a basis of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ is too small and $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})^{\perp}$ is not big enough to generate f. ■

Remark 20 *If the elements in the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ are ordered in a decreasing way according to a term order (the biggest element is at the left end, the smallest at the right end and position t means counting t elements from the right to the left) an analogous probability formula would be*

$$P = \frac{\textit{Number of arrangements that place the mon. functions in } f \textit{ after position } s}{\textit{Total number of arrangements}} \qquad (10)$$

where an arrangement is an order of the elements of $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ that obeys a term order. (Two different term orders could generate the same arrangement of the elements in the finite set $\{g_{nq\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$). So, for instance, if f contains a term involving the monomial function $x_1^{q-1} \cdot ... \cdot x_n^{q-1}$, then the above probability (10) would be equal to zero, since every arrangement of the elements in $\{g_{nq\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ that obeys a term order would make that monomial function biggest. (It is inherent to term orders to make some monomial functions always *biggest). In more general terms, it is difficult to make estimates about the numbers involved in (10). This shows some of the disadvantages of using term orders.*

Remark 21 *Since for relatively small n and q the number $d := q^n$ is already very large, it is obvious that one should calculate the asymptotic behavior of the probability formula (9) for $d \to \infty$. Indeed, we have with $t \leq m$*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \quad &\leq \quad \frac{\binom{d-t}{d-m}}{\binom{d}{m}} = \frac{\frac{(d-t)!}{(d-m)!(m-t))!}}{\frac{d!}{m!(d-m)!}} \\ &= \quad \frac{(d-t)!m!}{(m-t)!d!} \leq \frac{(d-t)!m!}{d!} \\ &= \quad \frac{m!}{d(d-1)...(d-t+1)} \longrightarrow 0 \textit{ for } d \longrightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

If we write the amount of data used in proportion to the size $d = q^n$ of the space $\mathbf{F}_q^n$, and the number of terms displayed by f relative to the size q^n of the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$, it becomes apparent how quickly the probability formula converges to 0 for $d \longrightarrow \infty$. So let $r := m/d$

and $\gamma := d - t$. *Then we would have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{P}{r^d} &= \frac{\binom{d-t}{d-m}}{r^d\binom{d}{m}} = \frac{(d-t)!m!}{r^d(m-t)!d!} \\
&= \frac{m(m-1)...(m-t+1)}{r^d d(d-1)...(d-t+1)} = \frac{rd(rd-1)...(rd-t+1)}{r^d d(d-1)...(d-t+1)} \\
&= \frac{rdrd(1-\frac{1}{rd})...rd(1-\frac{t-1}{rd})}{r^d dd(1-\frac{1}{d})...d(1-\frac{t-1}{d})} = \frac{r^t d^t(1-\frac{1}{rd})...(1-\frac{t-1}{rd})}{r^d d^t(1-\frac{1}{d})...(1-\frac{t-1}{d})} \\
&= \frac{r^t(1-\frac{1}{rd})...(1-\frac{t-1}{rd})}{r^d(1-\frac{1}{d})...(1-\frac{t-1}{d})} \\
&= \frac{r^{-\gamma}(1-\frac{1}{rd})...(1-\frac{t-1}{rd})}{(1-\frac{1}{d})...(1-\frac{t-1}{d})} \longrightarrow r^{-\gamma} \text{ for } d \longrightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, it holds

$$\frac{\binom{d-t}{d-rd}}{\binom{d}{rd}} \approx r^t \text{ for big } d$$

This expression shows in a straightforward way how big the proportional amount of data should be in order to have an acceptable confidence in the obtained result. It also shows that for t *close to* d *the probability is very low and the reverse engineering not feasible. Usually no information about* t *is available, so it is advisable to work with the maximal* t, *namely* $d-1$ *or with an average value for* t.

4 Conclusions

The results we have obtained in the previous section provide guidelines on how to design experiments to generate data to be used with the LS-algorithm for the purpose of reverse engineering a biochemical network.
The following are minimal requirements on a set $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$, such that the LS-algorithm reverse engineers f based on the knowledge of the values that it takes on every point in the set X :

1. If the LS-algorithm is used to reverse engineer a nonzero function $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)\backslash\{0\}$, necessarily the data set X used must contain points were the function does not vanish. In other words, not all the interpolation conditions must be of the type $\vec{x}_i \mapsto 0$ (Theorem 10).

2. If the LS-algorithm is used to reverse engineer a function $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)\backslash\{0\}$ displaying t different terms, it requires **at least** t different data points to *completely* reverse engineer f (Remark 12).

3. If $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)\backslash\{0\}$ is a polynomial function containing all p^n possible fundamental monomial functions, no *proper* subset $X \subset \mathbf{F}_q^n$ of $\mathbf{F}_q^n$ will allow the LS-algorithm to find f (Remark 12).

Our results also make possible the identification of optimal sets $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ that make the LS-algorithm more likely to succeed in reverse engineering a function $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ based only on the knowledge of the values that it takes on every point in the set X. Optimal data sets $X \subset \mathbf{F}_q^n$ are characterized by the property that $\ker(\Phi_{\vec{X}})$ is in general position with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ (see Definitions 17 and 14). Their advantage is given by the fact that they do not impose constraints on the set of candidate terms that can be used to construct a solution. Summarizing we can say:

1. Even though such sets can be constructed in particular examples (see Appendix), further research is required to prove their existence in general terms.

2. If no optimal sets can be determined, it is still advantageous to work with pseudo-optimal data sets (see Remark and Definition 18).

Since the identified optimal data sets are sets $X \subset \mathbf{F}_q^n$ of discretized vectors, in a real application, the optimal data set X has to be transformed back to a corresponding set $\widetilde{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of real vectors. This transformation can be performed using an "inverse" function of the discretization mapping (1). This "inverse" function has to be defined by the user, given the fact that discretization mappings are highly non-injective and by definition map entire subsets $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ into a single value $\vec{z} \in \mathbf{F}_q^n$.

Having characterized optimal data sets, the next step in our approach was to provide an exact formula for the probability that the LS-algorithm will find the correct model under the assumption that an optimal data set is used as input. As stated in Remark 20, we weren't able to find such a formula for the LS-algorithm. The biggest difficulty we face is related to the use of term orders inherent to the LS-algorithm. We overcome this problem by considering a generalization of the LS-algorithm which we call the term-order-free reverse engineering method (see Appendix). This method not only allows for the calculation of the success probability but it also eliminates the issues and arbitrariness linked to the use of term orders (see Remark 20). In conclusion, our results on this issue are:

1. It is still an open problem how to derive a formula for the success probability of the LS-algorithm when optimal data sets are used as an input and the term order is chosen randomly. As stated in Remark 20, one of the main problems here is related to the use of term orders inherent to the LS-algorithm.

2. Let $f \in F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)\backslash\{0\}$ be a nonzero function consisting of the linear combination of exactly t fundamental monomial functions. If the linear order used by the term-order-free method is chosen randomly, the probability of successfully retrieving f using an optimal data set X of cardinality $|X| = m$ is given by (see Theorem 19)

$$P = \frac{\binom{q^n - t}{q^n - m}}{\binom{q^n}{m}} \text{ if } t \leq m \tag{11}$$

and

$$P = 0 \text{ if } t > m$$

3. Let $d = q^n$ be the cardinality of the space $\mathbf{F}_q^n$. Furthermore, let X be an optimal data set with cardinality $|X| = m$ and $r := m/d$ (note that $0 < r < 1$). Then the asymptotic behavior of the probability formula (11) for $d \to \infty$ (i.e. for $n \to \infty$) satisfies (see Remark 21)

$$\frac{\binom{d-t}{d-rd}}{\binom{d}{rd}} \approx r^t \text{ for big } d$$

As a consequence of the latter, we conclude that even if an optimal data set is used and the restrictions imposed by the use of term orders are overcome, the reverse engineering problem remains unfeasible, unless experimentally impracticable amounts of data are available.

Finally, we comment on one scenario identified in (Just, 2006). Specifically, in Conclusion 4(a), (Just, 2006) makes the assumption that the wiring diagram of each of the underlying functions is known, i.e. the variables that actually affect the function f are known. Under this assumption, let k be the number of variables affecting f. If one could perform specific experiments such that for all possible values that the k variables can take the response of the network is measured, the function f would be uniquely determined. In this situation, reverse engineering f wouldn't imply making any choices among possible solutions. This raises the question of how many measurements are needed and how big this data set would be in proportion to the size q^n of the space $\mathbf{F}_q^n$ of all possible states the network can theoretically display. The number of measurements needed is q^k and therefore the proportion is equal to

$$\frac{q^k}{q^n} = \frac{1}{q^{n-k}}$$

If k is small compared to n (which is generally assumed by (Just, 2006)), then the proportion would be conveniently small. In other words, in *relative* terms, it is worth performing the q^k specific experiments. However, performing q^k measurements might still be beyond experimental feasibility.

5 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Michael Shapiro for helpful comments and Dr. Winfried Just for an informative and stimulating e-mail exchange. We are grateful to Dr. Karen Duca and Dr. David Thorley-Lawson for their support. We also would like to express our gratitude to Jill Roughan and Dr. Karen Duca for proofreading the manuscript.

6 Appendix

6.1 Examples of vector spaces in general position and the codimension condition

Example 22 *Let $n = 2$, $q = 2$ and consider the vector space $F_2(\mathbf{F}_2)$ an its basis $(g_{22\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_2^2} = (x_1x_2, x_1, x_2, 1)$ ordered according to the lexicographic order with $x_1 > x_2$. Furthermore let $U := span(x_1x_2 + x_1 + x_2 + 1)$. The basis vector $u_1 := x_1x_2 + x_1 + x_2 + 1$ has the coordinates $(1, 1, 1, 1)^t$ with respect to the basis $(g_{22\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_2^2}$. Therefore, U is in general position with respect to $(g_{22\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_2^2}$. It is easy to verify*

$$\begin{aligned}\left|V(\langle\varphi^{-1}(u_1)\rangle)\right| &= \left|\{(x,y)\in\mathbf{F}_2^2 \mid xy+x+y+1=0 \ mod\ 2\}\right| \\ &= |\{(0,1),(1,0),(1,1)\}| = 3 \\ &= 2^2-1 = codim(U)\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the set $X := \{(0,1),(1,0),(1,1)\}$ constitutes an optimal data set to reverse engineer any function $f \in F_2(\mathbf{F}_2)$ displaying no more than 3 terms. If the term-order-free reverse engineering method is used, the probability of successfully retrieving a nonzero function displaying 1 term would be

$$P = \frac{\binom{2^2-1}{2^2-3}}{\binom{2^2}{3}} = \frac{\binom{3}{1}}{\binom{4}{3}} = \frac{3}{4} = 0.75$$

For a function displaying 2 terms $P = 0.5$ and 3 terms $P = 0.25$.

Example 23 *Let $n = 2$, $q = 3$ and consider the vector space $F_2(\mathbf{F}_3)$ an its basis $(g_{23\alpha})_{\alpha\in M_3^2} = (x_1^2x_2^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1x_2^2, x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_2^2, x_1, x_2, 1)$ ordered according to a total degree term order with $x_1 > x_2$. Furthermore let U be the 8-dimensional subspace of $F_2(\mathbf{F}_3)$ generated by*

$$U := span(x_1^2x_2^2 + x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2 + x_1x_2^2, x_1x_2^2 + x_1^2, x_1^2 + x_1x_2, x_1x_2 + x_2^2, x_2^2 + x_1, x_1 + x_2, x_2 + 1)$$

The coordinate vectors of the generating vectors are

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{u}_1 &:= (1,1,0,...,0)^t \\ \widehat{u}_2 &:= (0,1,1,0,...,0)^t \\ &\vdots \\ \widehat{u}_8 &:= (0,...,0,1,1)^t\end{aligned}$$

By calculating the determinant of the matrices

$$A_j := \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{u}_1^t \\ \widehat{u}_2^t \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{u}_8^t \\ e_j^t \end{pmatrix}, \ j = 1, ..., 9$$

(where e_j is the jth canonical unit vector of $\mathbf{F}_3^9$), one can easily show that U is in general position with respect to $(g_{23\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_3^2}$. To determine the set $V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_8) \rangle)$, we start solving the three last equations given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x_2^2 + x_1 = 0 & & x_2^2 = -1 \\ x_1 + x_2 = 0 & \Leftrightarrow & x_1 = 1 \\ x_2 + 1 = 0 & & x_2 = -1 \end{array}$$

This system of equations has no solution in the set $\mathbf{F}_3^2$. Therefore

$$V(\langle \varphi^{-1}(u_1), ..., \varphi^{-1}(u_8) \rangle) = \emptyset$$

Consequently, U does not satisfy the codimension condition and thus does not yield an optimal data set.

6.2 Existence of vector subspaces in general position

The proof is easy but quite technical. The basic idea of the proof is to treat the problem over the real numbers and then construct a solution over finite fields based on the existence of a solution over the real numbers. This last step takes advantage of the density of the rational numbers in the set of real numbers.

We recall the definition of general position for vector spaces over a finite field:

Definition 24 *Let W be a finite dimensional vector space over a finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$ with $\dim(W) = d > 0$. Furthermore, let $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ be a fixed basis of W and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ a natural number with $s < d$. A vector subspace $U \subset W$ with $\dim(U) = s$ is said to be in* general position *with respect to the basis $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ if for any basis $(v_1, ..., v_s)$ of U and any injective mapping*

$$\pi : \{1, ..., (d-s)\} \to \{1, ..., d\}$$

the vectors

$$v_1, ..., v_s, w_{\pi(1)}, ..., w_{\pi(d-s)} \tag{12}$$

are linearly independent.

It can be easily shown that if the linear independence condition (12) holds for one basis of U, it holds for every other basis of U.

Now we will construct an s-dimensional subspace $U \subset W$ in general position with respect to a given basis of W, where s is an arbitrary natural number with $s < d$. For this purpose

we will find the coordinates with respect to the basis $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ of a basis of U. We denote the sought coordinates as follows

$$\vec{\xi}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_d \end{pmatrix}, \vec{\xi}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} x_{d+1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{2d} \end{pmatrix}, \cdots, \vec{\xi}_s = \begin{pmatrix} x_{(s-1)d+1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{sd} \end{pmatrix}$$

The next step is to count all different injective mappings $\pi : \{1, ..., (d-s)\} \to \{1, ..., d\}$ as $\pi_1, ..., \pi_N$. For each π_i we consider the coordinate vectors $\vec{\xi}_1, ..., \vec{\xi}_s, \vec{e}_{\pi_i(1)}, ..., \vec{e}_{\pi_i(d-s)}$ with respect to the basis $(w_1, ..., w_d)$, where $\vec{e}_j$ is the jth canonical unit vector of $\mathbf{F}_q^d$. Now, for $i = 1, ..., N$ we define the determinant functions

$$\begin{array}{rcl} D_{\pi_i} & : & \mathbb{R}^{sd} \to \mathbb{R} \\ \vec{x} & \mapsto & \left| \vec{\xi}_1, ..., \vec{\xi}_s, \vec{e}_{\pi_i(1)}, ..., \vec{e}_{\pi_i(d-s)} \right| \end{array}$$

where $\vec{e}_j$ is seen as the jth canonical unit vector of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The linear independence condition (12) is equivalent to

$$D_{\pi_i}(\vec{x}) \neq 0$$

Due to the structure of $\left(\vec{\xi}_1, ..., \vec{\xi}_s, \vec{e}_{\pi_i(1)}, ..., \vec{e}_{\pi_i(d-s)} \right)$ and by the Leibniz determinant formula we know that D_{π_i} are nonzero polynomial functions in the variables $x_1, ..., x_{sd}$ and therefore nonzero analytic functions in $\mathbb{R}^{sd}$ with infinite radius of convergence, (in particular, continuous functions). Consequently, no D_{π_i} can be identical to zero on any open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{sd}$. By the continuity of D_{π_1} we know that there is a non-empty open subset $O_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{sd}$ such that $D_{\pi_1}|_{O_1} \neq 0$. Using the same argument we know that there is a non-empty set $O_2 \subseteq O_1$ open in $\mathbb{R}^{sd}$ such that $D_{\pi_2}|_{O_2} \neq 0$. After applying this argument N times we identify a non-empty open subset $O_N \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{sd}$ such that $D_{\pi_i}|_{O_N} \neq 0 \ \forall \ i \in \{1, ..., N\}$. Since the set $\mathbb{Q}^{sd}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{R}^{sd}$, there is a point $\vec{y} \in O_N$ with rational entries, i.e. $y_l \in \mathbb{Q} \ \forall \ l \in \{1, ..., sd\}$. Let

$$\vec{y} = (\frac{a_1}{b_1}, ..., \frac{a_{sd}}{b_{sd}})^t$$

and $c := \prod_{k=1}^{sd} b_k$. Since $\vec{y} \in O_N$, we know $D_{\pi_i}(\vec{y}) \neq 0 \ \forall \ i \in \{1, ..., N\}$. By the rules of determinants we also know

$$D_{\pi_i}(c\vec{y}) \neq 0 \ \forall \ i \in \{1, ..., N\}$$

Moreover, $c\vec{y}$ has integer entries, i.e. $cy_l \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall \ l \in \{1, ..., sd\}$. For a sufficiently large prime number p, the entries cy_l can be seen as elements of the finite field $\mathbf{F}_p$ of integers modulo p. Therefore, the values $cy_l \in \mathbf{F}_p$, $l = 1, ..., sd$ can be used as the coordinates with respect to the basis $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ of a basis for an s-dimensional subspace $U \subset W$ in general position with respect to the basis $(w_1, ..., w_d)$ of W, a vector space over the finite field $\mathbf{F}_p$. ■

6.3 The term-order-free reverse engineering algorithm

The input of the term-order-free reverse engineering algorithm is a set $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ of $m \leq q^n$ different data points, a list of m interpolation conditions

$$\vec{x}_i \mapsto b_i,\ x_i \in X$$

and a linear order $>$ for the elements of the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$, (i.e. the elements of the basis are ordered decreasingly according to $>$). The steps of the algorithm are as follows:

1. Calculate the entries of the matrix

   $$A := (\Phi_{\vec{X}}(g_{nq\alpha}))_{\alpha \in M_q^n} \in M(m \times q^n; \mathbf{F}_q)$$

   representing the evaluation epimorphism $\Phi_{\vec{X}}$ of the tuple $\vec{X}$ with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ of $F_n(\mathbf{F}_q)$ and the canonical basis of $\mathbf{F}_q^m$.

2. Calculate a basis $\vec{y}_1, ..., \vec{y}_s \in \mathbf{F}_q^d$ of $\ker(A)$.

3. Extend the basis $\vec{y}_1, ..., \vec{y}_s$ of $\ker(A)$ to a basis $(\vec{y}_1, ..., \vec{y}_s, \vec{y}_{s+1}, ..., \vec{y}_d)$ of $\mathbf{F}_q^d$ using the standard orthonormalization procedure. (See Section 4 of (Delgado-Eckert, under review)).

4. Define a generalized inner product $\langle ., . \rangle : \mathbf{F}_q^d \to \mathbf{F}_q$ by setting

   $$\langle \vec{y}_i, \vec{y}_j \rangle := \delta_{ij}\ \forall\ i, j \in \{1, ..., d\}$$

   and calculate the entries of the matrix S defined by

   $$S_{ij} := \langle \vec{e}_i, \vec{e}_j \rangle\ ,\ i, j \in \{1, ..., q^n\}$$

   where $\vec{e}_j$ is the jth canonical unit vector of $\mathbf{F}_q^d$.

5. The coordinate vector with respect to the basis $(g_{nq\alpha})_{\alpha \in M_q^n}$ of the output function is obtained by solving the following system of inhomogeneous linear equations

   $$\begin{aligned} A\vec{z} &= \vec{b} \\ \vec{y}_i^t S \vec{z} &= 0,\ i = 1, ..., s \end{aligned}$$

The steps described above represent an intelligible description of the algorithm and are not optimized for an actual computational implementation.

References

Cox, D., Little, J., & O'Shea, D. 1997. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms, An introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra*. Second edn. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. New York: Springer-Verlag.

De Jong, H. 2002. Modeling and Simulation of Genetic Regulatory Systems: A Literature Review. *J. Comput. Biol.*, **9**(1), 67–103.

Delgado-Eckert, E. under review. Canonical representatives for residue classes of a polynomial ideal and orthogonality. *Comm. Algebra*. See temporary version at http://arxiv.org/abs/0706.1952v1.

D'haeseleer, P., Liang, S., & Somogyi, R. 2000. Genetic Network Inference: From Co-Expression Clustering to Reverse Engineering. *Bioinformatics*, **16**, 707–726.

Gardner, T. S., & Faith, J. J. 2005. Reverse-engineering transcription control networks. *Phys. Life Rev.*, **2**, 65–88.

Golan, J. S. 2004. *The Linear Algebra a Beginning Graduate Student Ought to Know*. Texts in the Mathematical Sciences. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Just, W. 2006. Reverse engineering discrete dynamical systems from data sets with random input vectors. *J. Comput. Biol.*, **13**(8), 1435–1456 (electronic).

Kauffman, S. A. 1993. *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Laubenbacher, R., & Stigler, B. 2004. A computational algebra approach to the reverse engineering of gene regulatory networks. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **229**(4), 523–537.

Ljung, L. 1999. *System identification: theory for the user*. Second edn. Prentice Hall information and system sciences series. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall PTR.

Thomas, R. 1991. Regulatory networks seen as asynchronous automata: A logical description. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **153**(1), 1–23.